



2863  
#5 Response  
V. Brown  
10/8/03  
S&H Form (2701)

Attorney Docket No. 826.1788

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Sekiji NISHINO, et al.

Application No.: 10/057,887

Group Art Unit: 28<sup>63</sup>~~77~~

Confirmation No.: 2402

Filed: January 29, 2002

Examiner:

For: METHOD AND DEVICE GENERATING DATA INPUT TO AN ELECTROMAGNETIC  
FIELD INTENSITY CALCULATING DEVICE

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED  
OCT - 3 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed June 30, 2003, having a period for response set to expire on September 30, 2003. In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-9 were pending in the application; rejected claims 1 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and objected to claims 2-6 as dependent from a rejected base claim. In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 5,940,310 to Yamaguchi et al. and 5,966,524 to Burnett et al. (References B and A, respectively) were cited. Claims 1-9 remain in the case. the Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In rejecting the claims, Yamaguchi et al. was cited as disclosing "partitioning a surface corresponding to ... surface data into ... meshes" (claim 1, lines 8-9) at column 5, lines 15-36 and Burnett et al. was cited as disclosing quadrilateral meshes at column 7, lines 39-57. However, Burnett et al. does not disclose forming the rectangular mesh on a surface, but rather to form "nodal patterns arranged within sectors of ... quadrilateral cross-section" (column 7, lines 47-48 in a spherical coordinate system like that illustrated in Fig. 4. The cited portion of Burnett et al. states that a "mesh generator, a programmed, general-purpose digital computer" (column 7, lines 40-41) was known for this purpose. However, the spatial partitioning taught by Burnett et al. is significantly different from both the partitioning disclosed by Yamaguchi et al. and the surface partitioning recited in the independent claims. It is submitted that the combined

teachings of Yamaguchi et al. and Burnett et al. would not suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art "partitioning a surface corresponding to the surface data into quadrilateral meshes" (claim 1, lines 8-9) so that "data partitioned into meshes" (claim 1, line 10) can be output to an electromagnetic field intensity calculating device. This provides the benefit of making it possible to determine the current that flows on a surface more accurately and efficiently than can be accomplished by anything resulting from the combination of Yamaguchi et al. and Burnett et al.

For the above reasons, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Yamaguchi et al. in view of Burnett et al. Since the limitations quoted above from claim 1 are also recited in claims 7-9, it is submitted that claims 7-9 similarly distinguish over Yamaguchi et al. in view of Burnett et al.

Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. If any fees are required in regard to this Response, please charge same to our Deposit Account 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

9/30/03

By:

Richard A. Gollhofer

Richard A. Gollhofer

Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501